

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/073,314 | HOSHI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Amar Movva | 2891 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Amar Movva (PTO).

(3) _____.

 (2) Michael Caridi (applicant's representative).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 September 2007
Time: 10:45
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1,13


Prior art documents discussed:

Kepler '671

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
Discussed applicability of Kepler reference to applicant's claims.
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

B. WILLIAM BAUMEISTER
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENT.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)